PROCLAMATION

BY THE

Conserver of the State of Texas

41-1746

TO ALL TO WHOM THESE PRESENTS SHALL COME:

in SB 210.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
P. O. BOX 12488-CAPITOL STATION
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711
JUN 2 1 1979

June 13, 1979

Pursuant to Λ rticle IV,Section 14 of the Constitution of Texas, I hereby veto Senate Bill 210 because of the following objections:

Some may argue that the concept of single member districts for local, appointive boards, like that of the Dallas County Hospital District and other local boards, has merit. Except for the observations made below, I do not address the merits of that question in this message.

SB 210 is mechanically and procedurally deficient. In

My reasons for disapproval are as follows:

- establishing of county-wide system of single-member districts, SB 210 ties the boundaries of the districts irrevocably and permanently to the boundaries of legislative districts numbered 33A through 33R as they existed on a date certain in the past. Fundamentally, any system of single-member districts must allow for shifts in population coupled with the power to redefine boundaries. SB 210 does not grant the power to redefine boundaries either to the Commissioners' Court of Dallas County or to the board of the district. Thus, the local community is given no power or ability to extricate itself from an obvious constitutional defect, with the result that the courts would be called upon to cure a problem which the legislature itself created.
- 2. The legislature should not actually draw the lines of single-member districts for local governments, either elective or appointive. When it is determined that single-member districts for local communities is desirable as a matter of State policy, the legislature should limit its role to one of mandating that local districting be established through the local, affected agencies in accordance with constitutional standards. Neither the legislature nor the Governor's Office is equipped to fairly define the boundaries of all local communities in Texas where single-member districts might be desirable, and that precedent should not be established in a single instance as is done

In this action, I neither approve or disapprove the concept of single-member districts for appointive local boards. I do observe, however, that SB 210 establishes a precedent in an essentially local instance that has statewide implications for other hospital districts and hundreds of other local, appointive boards such as planning and zoning commissions, airport boards, housing authorities and others. It is thus a question of major state policy and should be considered on that basis, if at all. It should not be considered by the legislature as a matter of purely local significance. I consider this and either one of the enumerated reasons to be a sufficient reason for disapproving and vetocing Senate Bill 210.

Respectfully,

William P. Clements, Jr.

JUN 14 1979

FILED IN THE OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF SIA